DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 009 FL 027 159

AUTHOR	Hayes, Katherine; Salazar, Jesus Jose
TITLE	Evaluation of the Structured English Immersion Program. Final Report: Year I.
INSTITUTION	Los Angeles Unified School District, CA. Program Evaluation and Research Branch.
PUB DATE	2001-03-12
NOTE	80p.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Education; *English (Second Language); *Immersion Programs; Language of Instruction; Literacy Education; Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This report describes a districtwide evaluation of the instructional services provided to English language learners (ELLs) enrolled in Structured English Immersion classrooms in grades 1-3. The program uses two models (teaching in English, with the primary language for clarification, and teaching primarily in English, with other instruction in the primary language). The report presents background information; describes study methodology (sample selection; data collection via classroom observations, interviews, and work samples; and data analysis); and reports findings. Classrooms included students in different grade levels, students assigned to different structured English immersion instructional models, and students with three or more different English language development levels. The predominant language of instruction was English. Listening, oral reading, oral speech production, and writing were most often observed. There were few English language development lessons or experiential hands-on learning activities, and very little primary language support was seen. Considerable confusion occurred about the definition and implementation of the two Structured English immersion models, resulting in uneven implementation of the program. Teachers noted a lack of resources and training. They also reported that parents could not help students with homework. Seven appendixes include information on the study and tables and charts on ELL education. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 462 009

Evaluation of the Structured English Immersion Program
FINAL Report: Year I
March 12, 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Katherine Hayes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Presented by:

Katherine Hayes and Jesús José Salazar
Language Acquisition and Literacy
Program Evaluation and Research Branch
450 N. Grand Ave. A-413

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL027159

Evaluation of the Structured English Immersion Program
Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
A.	Background	1
B.	Perspectives and Theoretical Framework	2
C.	Research Questions	4
II.	Methods	4
A.	Evaluation Hypotheses	4
B.	Sample Selection	8
C.	Data Collection Methodology	9
D.	Data Analysis	11
III.	Findings	12
A.	Demographic Overview	12
B.	Research Question 1	16
C.	Research Question 2	23
D.	Research Question 3	29
IV.	Conclusions	37
A.	Summary	36
B.	Implications	39

Appendices

A	Data Collection Instruments
B	Site Summary
C	Codebook
D.	ELD Mixes
E	Teacher Authorization to Teach ELLs
F	Teacher Years of Service
G	Actual NCE Gains

Evaluation of the Structured English Immersion Program
Final Report: Year I
March 12, 2001

I. Introduction

This document contains the preliminary findings of a districtwide evaluation focusing on the instructional services provided to English Language Learners (ELLs)[1] enrolled in Structured English Immersion classrooms in Grades 1, 2, and 3. Year 1 of this five-year evaluation provides the baseline information necessary to document the initiation of structured English immersion and its impact on the academic performance of ELLs. Years 2 through 5 will examine the continued implementation of structured English immersion and the continuing impact of the program on first, second and third grade ELLs.

The document contains four sections. The introductory section presents the background of the evaluation, a discussion of the perspectives and theoretical framework into which it is set, and the research questions. Section II presents the methodology employed in the study, including a discussion of the sample selection, data collection methodology (classroom observations, interviews and work samples) and data analysis (qualitative and quantitative with a special focus on student performance indicators). Section III contains the findings for Year I and is organized to specifically address the research questions presented earlier in the document. Section IV presents the conclusions and implications of the study findings.

A. Background

Proposition 227 is a California ballot initiative passed in June 1998 requiring that "all children in California public schools shall be taught English by being taught in English." The Proposition states, "Sheltered English immersion or 'structured English immersion' means an English language acquisition process for young children in which nearly all classroom instruction is in English but with the curriculum and presentation designed for children who are learning the language." The term 'sheltered or structured immersion' encompasses several possible instructional approaches depending on the philosophical orientation of the person defining the term. Keith Baker (1999) cites Ramirez in defining a Structured English Immersion program as "one (1) where English is used and taught at a level appropriate to the class of English language learners – that's different from the way English is used in mainstream classrooms, and (2) teachers are oriented toward maximizing instruction in English and use English for 70-90% of instructional time, averaged over the first three years of instruction."

Other educators define Structured English Immersion as a combination of instructional strategies including Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), and English Language

[1] Also known as English Learners (ELs) or limited-English-proficient (LEP) students.

Development (ELD) or English as a Second Language (ESL) strategies. Educators believe beginning students need to be taught by a highly skilled ESL or bilingual teacher who is qualified in second language teaching methods, language acquisition theory, and second language literacy pedagogy.

District schools serving ELLs began implementing the Structured English Immersion Program Model A or B by midyear of the 1998-99 school year, and most had a program in place by September 1999. The program in Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) utilizes two models of instruction. District guidelines state "Structured English Immersion Model A provides instruction in English. Students are taught English language skills and academic vocabulary in English. Students will be taught using special methods in English, with primary language support to facilitate comprehension, as necessary. Instruction will focus on the development of both functional and academic English language skills in the critical areas needed for success in school."

Alternatively, Structured English Immersion Model B "provides instruction in English language development almost entirely in English. In addition, grade-level content is taught using specially designed English instruction methodology and primary language instructional support."

Parents have the right to place their children in an alternative educational program such as a Basic Bilingual Program or a Dual-Language Program. They may also place their children into mainstream classes in which instruction is in English with accommodation for English level.

The focus of this evaluation is the Structured English Immersion classroom, Model A or Model B. Our overall research objectives are to explore: (1) the differences in Models A and B with respect to English language arts programs; (2) the patterns of actual instructional practice in Structured English Immersion classes; and (3) the impact of variations in instructional practice on the development of English language skills and on academic achievement for English language learners.

B. Perspectives and Theoretical Framework

A number of principles from language acquisition research have contributed to the development of Structured English Immersion. The Structured English Immersion model is grounded in the understanding that learners can acquire content knowledge, concepts, and skills at the same time that they improve their English language skills (Echeverria, 2000). Research has shown that second language acquisition is enhanced through meaningful use and interaction with the second language (Genesee, 1994). In other words, according to Structured English Immersion proponents, direct language instruction that is separate from academic instruction is less effective. Through the study of grade-level content, students interact with meaningful material that is relevant to their schooling. The English level used in sheltered classes must be continually monitored or negotiated by the teacher and students, and content made comprehensible through the use of modeling, demonstrations, graphic organizers, adapted texts, and visual aids.

recognizes that language processes (listening, speaking, reading and writing) develop interdependently, therefore, Structured English Immersion lessons are organized to integrate those skills.

Because language learning is a long-term process, English language learners' best chance for overall success in school is to begin studying the grade-level curriculum as soon as possible (Echeverria, 2000). While beginning English language learners may not complete a full year's curriculum, through Structured English Immersion they can make progress towards meeting content standards and gain a foundation in academic domains as their English skills improve. The Structured English Immersion approach provides students with meaningful academic experiences that also contribute to the development of their academic language skills. This type of language development teaches social and academic language, including skills such as analyzing and summarizing cognitively-demanding material, arguing a position, interpreting data represented visually, and other skills that are necessary for success in school.

Research into bilingual education (Cummins, 1995; Krashen, 1995; Ramirez, 1992) has demonstrated that well implemented bilingual education programs ensure the academic growth of non-English-speaking students. Individuals such as Baker (1999), Porter (1990) and Rossell and Baker (1996) claim that Structured English Immersion approaches provide much needed bilingual education reform to schools. The manner in which SDAIE is practiced is also a topic of much discussion. For example, according to Mora (1999), SDAIE is a set of strategies that should be used only for teaching academic content to ELL students at ELD level 3 or beyond (intermediate fluency) while ELD is used with beginning students to master new social and academic language and prepare students for content area knowledge and reading and literacy learning.

The work presented in this study has been informed by previous research focusing on the education of young ELLs (Goldenberg, 1994; Moll & Diaz, 1993; Trueba, 1991; Wong Fillmore, 1995). The focus of their work and ours is the interactional dynamics of the classroom situation, that is, the "immediate environment of learning" (Erickson, 1982). Using the tools of the classroom ethnographer,[2] on-site sustained observations of teacher and learner behaviors, detailed fieldnotes and a holistic cultural perspective, we will be able to document the extent to which Structured English Immersion is being implemented in LAUSD classrooms.

---

[2] This evaluation does not claim to be an ethnographic study, rather utilizes technique and tools of the classroom ethnographer to increase understanding of the classroom context.

C. Research Questions

The guiding questions for this evaluation include:

1. What is the nature of Structured English Immersion instructional services?? What are the patterns of instructional practice in each model?

2. Are there differences between instructional practices and curriculum implementation in the area of English language arts for students in Structured English Immersion Models A and B?

3. What is the impact of variations in instructional practice on the development of English language skills and on academic achievement for English language learners?

II. Methods

This section presents the methodology employed in the implementation of the Structured English Immersion Program Evaluation during the school year 1999-2000. It contains a discussion of: the evaluation hypotheses, the sample selection, data collection methodology (including classroom observations, field notes, observation instruments and teacher interviews) and data analysis procedures.

A. Evaluation hypotheses

While it was necessary to develop working hypotheses to inform and define the focus of the study, it must be noted that the first year of the evaluation is exploratory in nature, and seeks to develop a deeper understanding of the issues and processes that bear on the implementation of the Structured English Immersion in L.A.U.S.D.

What is the nature of Structured English Immersion instructional services? What are the patterns of instructional practice in each model?

The first question relates to the nature of instructional delivery in Structured English Immersion classrooms. Citing *The Structured English Immersion Handbook for Elementary Schools* (LAUSD Language Acquisition Branch Training Materials), we would expect that the delivery of instruction and the type of accommodations provided in Models A and B differs only in the use of primary-language instruction and support.

- In Model A, instruction is in English. Students are taught English language skills in English. In addition, they are taught the content areas of social studies, science, math, health, music, art and physical education through the use of special methods in English,

with the primary language used for clarification, as needed. The content areas should be integrated into the language arts theme in order to maximize English language development.

- In Model B, instruction is *primarily* in English. Students are taught English language skills in English. In addition, they are taught the content areas of social studies, science, math, health, music, art and physical education through the use of special methods in English, *combined with primary-language instructional support.* The content areas should be integrated into the language arts theme in order to maximize English language development.

In structured English immersion, instruction in reading and writing is not delayed, rather incorporated into the language arts program from the beginning. The *Handbook* goes on further to state:

- A strong English literary program for ELLs is built upon second-language acquisition theory validated by research and successful classroom practices.
- The teaching of literacy is a logical extension of a comprehensive and explicit English oral-language development program.
- Good strategies for phonemic awareness, comprehensible vocabulary development, and print awareness are essential components of a balanced literary program.

Therefore, our working hypotheses for Research Question # 1 include the following:

- Teachers providing services in all Structured English Immersion classrooms will tailor their instruction to the needs of the English Language Learners in their classes.

- Structured English Immersion teachers will employ SDAIE strategies in accommodating their instructional practices to meet the needs of the English Language Learners in their classrooms.

- We will see evidence of SDAIE strategies in all Structured English Immersion classrooms, including:

  - Use of realia and visuals
  - English language development through music, art, and other content areas
  - Connection to prior knowledge and experience
  - Use of home language (L_1)
  - Guided reading and writing
  - Pre-teaching
  - Thematic teaching
  - Interaction
  - Organization and chunking of content

- We will see evidence of SDAIE environmental artifacts in all Structured English Immersion classrooms, including:

  - Word walls
  - Visuals
  - Realia
  - Small group seating arrangements

- We will see evidence of SDAIE materials in all Structured English Immersion classrooms, including:

  - Realia
  - Visuals
  - Primary language materials
  - Trade books
  - ELD standards
  - Graphic organizers
  - Information displayed in a variety of formats

- A comprehensive and explicit English oral-language development program will be evident

- Good strategies for phonemic awareness, comprehensible vocabulary development, and print awareness will be evident.

Are there differences between instructional practices and curriculum implementation in the area of English language arts for students in Structured English Immersion Models A and B?

In looking at the differences in curriculum implementation across Models A and B, it was important for the evaluators to arrive at an in-depth understanding of the definitions of each model. To garner that understanding, we again turned to *The Structured English Immersion Handbook for Elementary Schools*. Exhibit I presents that information.

Exhibit I - Differences between Models A and B	
MODEL A	**MODEL B**
Language of instruction - English Language Arts - in English Core curriculum taught daily using special methods in English (SDAIE) Primary language for clarification (paraeducator) Staffing - CLAD/LDS/SB 1969 with bilingual paraprofessional	Language of instruction - *Primarily* English Language Arts - *Primarily* in English Core curriculum taught daily using special methods in English (SDAIE) Primary language for concept development (teacher) Staffing - BCLAD/BCC

What are some of the ways in which Models A and B might differ in actual practice? We hypothesized that:

- There will be significantly greater use of students' home language (L_1) in classrooms providing Model B services than there will be in classrooms providing Model A services, therefore, in Model B classrooms:
  - Teachers will provide more direct instruction to students in L_1
  - Paraeducators will provide more instructional support to students in L_1
  - Students will ask more questions in L_1
  - Overall oral production in L_1 will be greater
  - Classrooms will contain more L_1 materials
- Students who receive Model A services will be exposed to more English language than will students who receive Model B services.
- Students who receive Model A services will have greater access to a comprehensible English curriculum than will students who receive Model B services
- Students who receive Model B services will have greater access to grade-level standards than will students who receive Model A services.
- Teachers will employ more SDAIE strategies in classrooms with greater numbers of ELLs or with a greater number of ELLs at ELD level 1, 2, or 3 than they will in classrooms with fewer ELLs or with most of their ELLs at ELD levels 3, 4 and 5.
- Teachers with authorizations to teach ELLs will employ more SDAIE strategies in their classrooms than will teachers who do not have authorization to teach ELLs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What is the impact of variations in instructional practice on the development of English language skills and on academic achievement for English language learners?

This phase of the study has to do with the difference in academic outcomes (as evidenced by SAT 9 scores in reading and language arts[3], and ELD levels[4]) between students of Model A and Model B classrooms.

Because there is a qualitative difference between students with different ELD levels, we will have to ensure that the students we compare in Model A and Model B classrooms come from the same "universe" of students. This is accomplished statistically by controlling for ELD levels, socio-economic status (SES), and teacher credentialing and authorization.

With respect to this research question, the following working hypotheses may be posed:

- Differences in student outcomes are more influenced by student ELD levels than by the placement of students into programs providing Model A versus Model B services.
- Differences in student outcomes are more influenced by teacher experience (as evidenced by teacher credentialing and years of experience) than by the placement of students into programs providing Model A versus Model B services.
- Differences in student outcomes are more influenced by teacher's experience in working with ELLs (as evidenced by teacher authorization) than by the placement of students into programs providing Model A versus Model B services.

B. Sample selection

A probability sample of 30 schools was selected to insure districtwide representation of schools serving ELLs. At this first stage, probabilities were assigned based on school enrollment. Stratification consisted of percentage of ELLs, size of school, and geographic region. At the second stage of selection, classrooms were randomly selected from among the Model A and B classrooms listed on official records for each school. This resulted in an initial sample of 206 first, second, third and combination (K-1, 1-2 or 2-3) grade classrooms. The final data collection included 29 schools and 177 classrooms. Twenty-nine classrooms were not included in the initial data collection due to the following reasons:

---

[3] In this evaluation, SAT 9 adjusted gains are used to determine academic growth.

[4] The use of ELD Levels are used to approximate a child's knowledge of English. The change from the SOLOM-LASSM assessments to the use of state criteria for ELD levels has resulted in a somewhat more subjective measure than may be desired for evaluation purposes.

- Classrooms were comprised largely of students whose parents had requested they receive basic bilingual services (N=6)
- Sample ELLs redesignated out of the Structured English Immersion program) prior to data collection (N=6)
- Scheduling difficulties (N=17)

The resultant sample is an equal probability sample of Model A or B first through third grade classrooms districtwide, allowing generalization of our findings for these programs to the district as a whole.

C. Data collection methodology

1. Classroom observations

The principle research approach utilized in this study was observational. Data collection was carried out in the classroom by off-track and retired elementary teachers and principals trained in observational methods. A classroom visit usually lasted from 2-3 hours during the morning instructional period as the focus of the observation was language arts activities. Descriptive data (taken from field notes and open-ended interviews with teachers) were then coupled with quantifiable data taken from observation instruments (See Appendix A) and student records to address the research questions. The activities and instruments utilized in the observation included:

- Classroom environment map and checklist
- Fieldnotes
- Timeline of classroom interaction structures (30 minutes per classroom visit)
- Classroom oral production patterns matrix (done twice during the visit for 5 minutes each)
- Classroom interaction analysis (done twice during the visit for 10 minutes each)
- Site summaries

a. **Classroom environment map and checklist:** The purpose of the environmental map was to provide a sense of: desk or seating arrangements, learning centers, computers, where the teacher positions him- or herself vis-a-vis the children; the availability of language arts materials and resources (primary language [L_1]and English); and whether or not children's work was exhibited. The checklist was used to document the physical environment of the classroom with regard to instruction. After completing the map, classroom observers scanned the room and noted the seating arrangements, instructional resources, student activities, and language development support in English and L_1.

b. **Fieldnotes:** Fieldnotes are defined as a written narrative describing in concrete terms, the activities and interactions observed. The purpose of the fieldnotes in Structured English Immersion evaluation was to provide the overall context in which ELD instruction took place. Fieldnote writing occurred before, during and after the completion of the

other observation instruments (forms). After classroom observers completed their observations, and they were no longer in the classroom setting, they then rewrote their fieldnotes translating raw notes into the typed narrative utilized in the analysis.

c. **Timeline of classroom interaction structures:** The purpose of this instrument was to document the activities, subject areas, grouping, student language mode, language content, language of instruction and language of support occurring during 30 minutes of classroom time principally during language arts instruction. Observers documented the time at which they began using the form and in one-minute increments, and noted the following:

- Whether the subject area was language arts, ELD, ESL or other;
- Whether or not the grouping was whole group, small group, triad (three students working together), paired (two students working together), or solo (individual);
- Whether the student language mode was listening, speaking, reading or writing;
- Whether the language content was Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS); Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), classroom management routines or discipline/behavior related;
- Whether the language of instruction was English, primary language, or L_1/L_2[5];
- Whether the language of support was English, primary language, or L_1/L_2; and
- The activity or type of activity.

d. **Classroom oral production patterns matrix:** This instrument was used to document the types of utterances produced by teacher and student during instructional dialogue. For the purposes of the study, we defined 'instructional dialogue' as occurring when the teacher presented or reviewed concepts, gave instructions, lead group discussions and/or helped individuals during seat work. Instructional dialogue probably did not occur during transitions from one activity to another or when the children read to themselves or to each other. For the purposes of these observations, an utterance was defined as a sentence, phrase or word meant to convey meaning.

e. **Classroom interaction analysis:** The purpose of this form was to track student-teacher interaction patterns as well as student-student interaction patterns. The format was adapted to any seating configuration. Observers began by drawing a simple map of the seating arrangement and teacher location. Then for ten minutes, they used arrows to indicate the general direction of interaction (not individual utterances), thereby providing a "snapshot" of the classroom dynamics.

f. **Site summaries**: At the end of each three-day observation, observers were instructed to complete an Observation Summary and a Summary Observation Statement. The Observation Summary is a scale that indicates the extent to which certain instructional

---

[5] L_1/L_2 signifies the use of both languages in the same dialogue..

practices were observed during the three days observers were on site. The Summary Observation Statement presents an overview of what was seen in the target classroom. It started with a general statement regarding the class composition, something about the teacher and the paraeducator (bilingual capability, years of experience teaching, etc.), and then a few paragraphs about the activities which generally occurred in the classroom. An example of a site summary can be found in Appendix B.

g. ***Teacher interviews:*** In addition to the three-day observations, classroom observers also conducted a short interview with each teacher observed. The interview usually occurred after observations were completed. Teachers were asked the following questions:

- What changes, if any, have occurred in your classroom as a result of the implementation of Structured English Immersion, Modes A or B?
- Tell me what the program model looks like in your classroom. Have you modified your teaching strategies or instructional delivery as you implement the new program models? How have you modified your teaching strategies or instructional delivery as you implement the new program models?
- Can you share the most positive or the most successful aspects of your instructional program? What impact do these aspects have on your English language learners?
- What have been the greatest challenges facing you in the implementation of this program?
- What other issues do you think impact your English language learners?

D. Data Analysis

The qualitative data reduction and analysis for the Structured English Immersion evaluation consisted of the rewriting of fieldnotes, and the development of a coding scheme (in accordance with district guidelines for sheltered English immersion and standards for students in ELD programs). Appendix C contains the Codebook for this study. Classroom observers who had shown exceptional prowess and dedication to the study were invited to serve as coders. All the fieldnotes were coded using the same codebook and then coded fieldnotes were verified independently. If inter-coder reliabilities did not reach 80%, fieldnotes were recoded by an independent coder until an 80% level was achieved.

Once the data were coded, text and codes were entered into NVivo, a qualitative data management program that allows the evaluator to index "chunks" of text according to the domains called for by the study and then to retrieve similar "chunks" for determining patterns, building theoretical models, and in making multi-site comparisons. The fieldnotes from the classroom observations are grouped according to the following attributes: Model A or B, classroom composition, and teacher background characteristics such as certification status, authorization and years of teaching experience.

The data from the observational instruments (Classroom Environment Checklist, Timeline of Classroom Interaction Structures, Classroom Oral Production Patterns Matrix) were all entered into SPSS. Descriptive statistics, frequencies, crosstabs, chi-square and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) comprised the analytic techniques employed in the study. With respect to the achievement test scores, matched student gains and adjusted gains were calculated and presented.

III. Findings

The purpose of this section is to present the preliminary findings from our research in 177 first, second and third grade classrooms serving ELLs. After presenting the demographic overview of the sample, the section will then focus on the nature of instructional services in Structured English Immersion classrooms, differences between Models A and B, and the impact of Structured English Immersion on student achievement outcomes.

A. Demographic Overview

The sample consisted of 177 first, second and third grade classrooms from 29 elementary schools. As can be observed in Exhibit II, our sample consisted of 48 first grade classrooms, 45 second grade classrooms, 51 third grade classrooms, 2 kindergarten-first grade classrooms, 15 first-second grade combination classrooms, and 16 second-third grade combination classrooms.

Exhibit II - Grade Levels

Grades Observed	Frequency	Percent
First	48	27
Second	45	25
Third	51	29
Kinder First Combination	2	1
First Second Combination	15	9
Second Third Combination	16	9
Total	177	100

Using SIS data to determine the placement of sample children into Model A or Model B programs, we found a wide range of possible program combinations. Exhibit III illustrates this point.

Exhibit III - Placement of ELLs into Classrooms by Instructional Models

Models	Frequency	Percent
A	37	21
AB	81	46
ABW	6	3
AW	1	1
B	48	27
BW	4	2
Total	177	100

Key: A= Model A B=Model B W=Waiver to Basic Bilingual Program

As can be noted in Exhibit III, 46% of the sample was comprised of classrooms offering instruction to a mixture of students designated to receive Model A or B services. Further, approximately 6% of the sample involved classes with children whose parents had requested waivers to the Basic Bilingual Program. The mixing of Model A and B service delivery to children in the same classrooms presents an important challenge to teachers. As we conducted the classroom observations, we realized that the ratio of children receiving Model A instructional services to children receiving Model B instructional services could have an influence on how a teacher implemented structured English immersion instruction. Therefore, we created another category known as "Classroom Composition Model." Exhibit IV presents those frequencies.

Exhibit IV - Classroom Composition Model

	Frequency	Percent
Exclusively Model A	37	21
Largely A	26	15
Half A and Half B	5	3
Largely B	53	30
Exclusively B	47	26
W Mixes	9	5
Total	177	100

This represents another level of analysis, taking the observational data into account when defining models. We would expect instructional practice to differ between Largely A and Largely B classrooms, particularly in classrooms with small numbers of children designated for one or another service.

The degree to which a classroom was homogeneous with respect to languages and ELD levels was also considered important in the analysis. Some educational theorists suggest that children from only two consecutive ELD levels should be grouped for ELD instruction. Others disagree, stating that the heterogeneous grouping of children with different ELD levels results in greater second language acquisition. As can be observed in Exhibit V, less than half the sample was

composed of classrooms in which children from only one ELD level or two consecutive ELD levels were found.

Exhibit V - Number of ELD Levels by Classroom

ELD Levels	Frequency	Percent
One Level Only	18	10
2 Levels Consecutive	64	36
2 Levels Not Consecutive	3	2
3 Levels Consecutive	66	37
3 Levels Not Consecutive	7	4
4 Levels Consecutive	17	10
4 Levels Not Consecutive	2	1
Total	177	100

The exact breakdown of ELD mixes can be found in Appendix D.

It is also interesting to note the breakdown of ELLs versus English speaking students in sample classrooms. As can be noted in the Exhibit below, classrooms with more than three-fourths of students designated as English Language Learners comprised 57% of the sample and classrooms with more than 90% ELLs comprised more than forty percent of the sample.

Exhibit VI - Percent of ELLs in Classrooms

Percent of ELLs	Frequency	Percent
25 % or less	25	14
26-50 %	27	15
51-75 %	24	14
76-89 %	26	15
90-100 %	75	42
Total	177	100

The final demographic information to be presented in this section focuses on the 177 teachers in the Structured English Immersion Evaluation Study sample. In Exhibit VII, it can be noted that over one-fourth of the sample had no state or district authorization to teach ELLs[6]. On the other hand, half of the overall sample were bilingual (possessing either A Level authorization or the BCLAD). The teacher's language ability will also be likely to have a strong influence on the manner in which he or she implements Structured English Immersion, particularly in Model B classrooms where instruction in L_1 plays a stronger role than in Model A classrooms.

---

[6] Teachers who had no state authorization may have been in-training or taking classes toward state authorization.

Exhibit VII - Authorization

Authorization	Frequency	Percent
A Level	34	19
BCLAD	54	31
CLAD/LDS	34	19
SB 1969	9	5
No Authorization	46	26
Total	177	100

A detailed explanation of the terms used in the Exhibit is found in Appendix E.

Exhibit VIII and Appendix F show the number of years sample teachers worked in the District and at the target schools. As can be noted in the Appendix, over 26 % of the sample has worked in the District three years or less.

Exhibit VIII - Teacher Years of Service

Years of Service	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
District	177	1	43	10.5	9.6
School	177	1	20	6.9	5.0

The impact of teacher experience and credentialing also needs to be addressed when examining the effects of Structured English Immersion Models A and B on the academic progress of English learners. Exhibit IX indicates that, while one-third of the teachers sampled have Bilingual Credentials[7], one-fifth of those sampled are teaching with Emergency Permits.

Exhibit IX - Permits and Credentials

	Number of teachers with Emergency Permit	Percent	Number of teachers with Bilingual Credentials	Percent
Yes	37	21	65	36
No	140	79	112	64
Total	177	100	177	100

The following section presents the preliminary findings from the study, particularly in light of the three research questions and the working hypotheses presented in earlier sections.

---

[7] The discrepancy between the numbers of teachers with BCLAD authorization and Bilingual Credentials may be explained by the fact that personnel records may not match the numbers from the Master Plan.

B. Research Question # 1: What is the nature of Structured English Immersion instructional services?

In addressing the specifics of our working hypotheses for Research Question # 1, the fieldnote data (classroom narratives) will be our most useful source. The sections below present a typical day in classrooms serving children assigned to Structured English Immersion Programs Model A or B. It has been noted earlier in this document that there is wide variability in sample classrooms making it difficult to depict the quintessential Model A or B classroom. Nonetheless, the features that differentiate these programs are highlighted below. The descriptions of "a typical day" are drawn from observational data and do not represent any one classroom, school, grade, or district. The dichotomies presented below are painted with a broad brush. For example, a typical day in a Model A classroom draws on data from the following:

- classrooms composed exclusively of children whose parents requested that they receive Model A services (A)
- mixed classrooms in which more than half of the students are designated Model A (AB, AW)
- multi-model classrooms in which the plurality of students are those designated as receiving Model A services (ABW)

Model A - Typical Day

The kids are on the floor. Ms. Green, the paraeducator, works individually with a recent arrival from Vietnam. The teacher, Ms. Willson, has told the third graders in the class to do their dictation. They sit to the side talking softly one to another. Seventeen second graders sit on the rug facing Ms. Willson. She reviews with them, the Roberto Clemente story, Some People I Know. She asks her students to tell her what they remember about Roberto Clemente. She asks a lot of questions and elicits information while she writes on the board:

> Growing Up: Born in Puerto Rico - Poor family - Played baseball, ball made out of string & tape - Parents taught him to share
>
> Became Famous: Baseball player - Pittsburgh Pirates - 23 home runs in 1961
>
> Helped Others: Went to hospitals - Helped give medicine, food & clothes to the earthquake people
>
> Remember Him: Died in a plane crash - In a baseball museum - On a Stamp

After that introduction, she describes the journal exercise which she has written on the board.

> *Write about someone who is special to you. Explain how you remember them.*

At 9:10, she sends students to their tables and tells them to write until 9:30 then they will come back together to share. Ms. Willson emphasizes they don't have to worry about spelling but that they should try to write neatly. The kids are at their table writing and talking softly, many in Spanish. Ms. Willson is monolingual English. As they finish, she calls them to the rug area table by group. Children from each group take turns going to the rug area and reading what they have written. The teacher tells the kids that they don't have to share if what they wrote is too private and they don't want to share. She sits on the floor with the children creating an intimate setting in which they read their journals. Those who have finished their journals, copy their spelling words from the board, divide each word into syllables, and sort them into alphabetical order.

WORD/PAGE	SYLLABLES	SYNONYMS	ABC ORDER
1. before		first	
2. horse		pony	
3. more		greater	
4. for		give	
5. door		gate	
6. born		created	
7. morning		sunrise	
8. corn		kernel	
9. forgot		absent minded	
10. shore		beach	

After finishing with the journal exercise, she calls all the second graders to the rug again. She tells her students that they are going to do dictation and writes on the board, "W" and asks the sound. Class says in unison, "w-w-w-w-w-w." She says, "watch." The kids reply, "wash." The teacher asks, "Wash?" And cautions them, "Watch the h." The kids repeat, "Watch." She writes, "h-o-r-s" and asks, "what is the sound?" Kids, "hors." Teacher asks, "What am I missing?" Daniel, "Silent e." She writes "The funn" and asks, "What am I missing?" Maria says, "Y" The teacher asks, "What does y think it is?" Jonathon, "e." Ms. Willson then asks, "What kind of e?" Jonah says, "long e." Ms. Willson writes, "They forgot to walk on the shore." and asks, "What do I end with a period?" "What is a shore? Give me a synonym for the shore." She tells kids to write dictation sentences and then give each other practice tests. She gives a small lecture about children not walking around the room. Ms. Willson asks, "Any questions because I need to move on to the 3rd graders?" As she walks across the room, she asks Ms. Green to please monitor the 2nd graders while she works with the 3rd graders.

Sitting at the kidney-shaped table in the back of the room with Jose and Mimi, she tells 3rd graders that now they can write their sentences about native Americans from the Northwest. She further instructs the children to write..."What are you studying? Tell me in a few sentences. Can you tell me why did they just use wood?" "Tell me what kind of food (she points to the board) and why they ate it. <Using the board to write the description.> "What kind of houses

did they live in and why? She also takes this opportunity to work with Hien (Vietnamese immigrant child) who reads to her (using flash cards), haltingly and without comprehending what he is reading. She puts Mimi in the role of peer teacher to Jose so that she can concentrate on Hien and the second graders who come to her with questions. Mimi is trying to teach Jose to write the word transportation. She writes on the board Transport *and asks Jose "What comes next?" He says tentatively, " a?" Mimi says, "No, actually it's ION." And writes* Transportion <sic> Ms. Willson, *busy with other children, does not notice.*

So, what is "typical" about the above described Model A classroom? In the first place, the teacher is a monolingual English speaker and her paraeducator is bilingual (although not necessarily bilingual in the language spoken by students). This classroom of twenty children in mixed grade levels is made up of students representing three different ELD levels, as well as English speaking students. ELLs speak to one another in English and in Spanish. Language Arts consists of activities devoted to reading comprehension, critical thinking, compositional writing, dictation, phonetic analysis, structural analysis, vocabulary development, and non-compositional writing. The teacher directs more than one classroom activity simultaneously and children get the least amount of her attention during seatwork or during peer teaching as the teacher is usually otherwise engaged. The paraeducator works with recent arrivals or children from low ELD groups and her principal activity consists of reviewing concepts presented in class or completing ESL lessons with the children.

A typical day in a Model B classroom draws on data from the following:

- classrooms composed exclusively of children receiving Model B services (B)
- mixed classrooms in which more than half of the students are designated Model B (BA, BW)
- multi-model classrooms in which the plurality of students are those designated as receiving Model B services (BAW)

Model B - Typical Day

Ms. Torres addresses the group at large, "We have a whole new book today and the name is <u>Red Leaf, Yellow Leaf</u> and the author is ....." and she writes the name on the board. "I want you to walk quietly to the reading area because I'm going to read to you." The 18 children comply. (There are 4 African American children and 14 Latino children, 6 boys and 8 girls.) The teacher joins the group and compliments, "I really like the way Maribel is facing me, she has her hands on her lap and she is ready to listen." Other children shift to mimic Maribel.

Ms. Torres reads the title, <u>Red Leaf, Yellow Leaf</u> and tells the group to look at the cover and tell her what the book is about. Salvador, "Cuando leaves change." The teacher continues, "During the fall, leaves fall..." Josua, "and the tree's gonna die." Ms. Torres, "No, I don't think so." Shakeem says something about what trees do in the fall. Luis, "...and apples, and apples." The teacher asks, "What time of the year do leaves fall?" "Before the winter, it's

called fall. That's why it's called fall, because the leaves fall." "What do you see on this page?" Alfonzo, "Maple tree seed." The kids are engaged, looking at the book and the teacher and answering the questions which she asks after reading each page.

In response to the page which talked about gathering tree sprouts and the question about what they are going to do next, Lupita says, "I think they went to the woods and they was gonna practice them." "Practice them?" Lupita, "I mean they was going to plan-ted them." The teacher affirms her statement, "They were going to plant them." Next picture, Ms. Torres asks, "What kind of a bird is this?" Someone answers, "Chicken." Another student laughs, "Chicken?" The teacher reads that the bird is some kind of chick-a-dee. Other questions she asks include, "What do you think they are doing?" "Why are they wrapping the roots?" "Do you think it's maybe because the squirrels won't eat them?'

She continues, "Are the trees growing?" "What time of year is it?" A student asks, "What is after spring?" Ms. Torres, "Summer." She reads one page about summer and the kids ask questions. She reads a page about how the author likes best to visit the trees in the fall and asks, "Why is it better to visit the trees in the fall? Samuel answers, "That's when the trees fall." She probes (without correcting the student) "How does the tree look during the fall?" and shows the picture of the tree with the brightly colored leaves. She says "ou, ah!!!" as though impressed with the beauty of the colored leaves and the children mimic her, "ou, ah!!" Amanda (EO) tells a story about how in the fall you can make piles of leaves.

She tells the children to walk to their tables and "Take out your journals, you are going to write in your journals." Ms. Torres writes on the board, "During the weekend I....." She walks to the back of the classroom and sits at her desk. Several of the kids approach her (sitting in the corner) to tell her about their weekends. She asked Ariel (a recent arrival), "Que hiciste este fin de semana?" [What did you do this weekend?] Jonathan (ELD 3) tells her, "I played Nintendo and watch television. I RE--laxed." As students begin working on their journals, the line around her desk grows. The teacher sends the children back to their seats to do their work so that she can work with individual students and tells them to raise their hands when they're ready. As students appear finished, she tells them to either read a book, or do their book reports, or work on the papers on the table. She talks to individual children quite a bit in Spanish. There's a sense of quiet calm even though the children converse quietly and not everyone is working.

After recess, she reads the poem "Humpty Dumpty." The teacher says, "Look at the poem, read it to yourself, and look for the words that rhyme." The children volunteer, "Humpty and Dumpty." "Wall, fall, and all." The teacher cautions the children that sometimes rhyming words aren't spelled the same at the end." She urges the children keep looking for other rhyming words until finally somebody guesses, "men and again." The teacher says, "Let's review a little bit of what we learned before." She writes on the board the word 'couldn't.' She asks, "What kind of word is that?" Ariel guesses that it is a compound word. The teacher tells him no and to try again. She says 'couldn't' is a different kind of word. When she gets no volunteers, she tells the children the word is a contraction. She says that 'couldn't' is made of the words <u>could</u> and <u>not</u> and that they

should consider this a shortcut way of writing could and not. She writes on the board, "Humpty Dumpty sat on an wall." And asks the children what is wrong with the sentence." Then she tells them in Spanish, "Tengo que borrar la ene." [I have to erase the 'n.']
She goes on and tells the children that the words "a" and "an" are articles and that it works the same in Spanish. "Articulos en Espanol son los articulos "un" y "uno." [The articles in Spanish are one and one.]

"Typical" features of the Model B classroom include the following: The teacher and para-educator are both bilingual. The children's home language is occasionally heard in academic settings and more frequently in social settings. Language intermingling and code switching is common. Children often speak to the teacher in their home language and she answers them in English. This classroom consists of twenty children from at least three different ELD levels as well as some children who speak English fluently[8]. The teacher takes pains to ensure that all her students understand the English vocabulary she presents to them either through direct translation or structured English approaches.

Language arts in a typical Model B classroom may consist of activities devoted to reading comprehension, translation, listening to stories read by the teacher, individual reading, using contextual cues, critical thinking, compositional writing, dictation, phonetic analysis, structural analysis, vocabulary development, and non-compositional writing. Recent arrivals usually are off to one side of the classroom, either doing seatwork or working with the paraeducators. Teachers attempt to integrate recent arrivals into daily classroom activities, but feel frustrated by their inability to meet the needs of ELD Level 1 students.

The following paragraphs present the results of observations in both Model A and Model B classrooms and describe the features of Structured English Immersion first, second and third grade classrooms districtwide. The most commonly observed instructional activities included[9]:

- Whole group instruction
- Listening practice
- Oral speech production
- Oral reading
- Writing/composition

---

[8] Many English Only students speak Non-Standard English.

[9] Data source - Observational Summaries

The least commonly observed instructional activities included:

- English language development
- Primary language support
- Experiential hands-on
- Sustained Silent Reading (SSR)
- Student self assessment

The environmental scan for all classrooms revealed that the most prevalent seating arrangements included: clusters of desks, the rug area and rows of tables. With respect to instructional resources, most common were: book displays, class library, maps/globes, reference books, chalkboard and computers. The most "popular" instructional centers were reading, science, and writing and evidence of student activities included group projects, reports, student-made books, art projects, journals and "read alouds." Evidence of language development instruction included word walls, sentence strips, rhymes, big books, word charts, pocket charts and the only evidence of primary language support were the L1 books observed in some classrooms.

On the other hand, we did not see significant numbers of:

- Seating arrangements in the form of circles or semi-circles of desks, and individual desks
- Puzzles/games, magazines, feltboards, live animals, and audio-visual equipment
- Music, art, social studies, listening, and math centers
- Evidence of student activities such as murals, puppet shows, letter writing, graphic organizers, story boards, presentations, map activities, hands-on activities, graphs, collages, experiments, book reports, poetry, surveys and portfolios
- Checklists, poems, and story mapping as evidence of language development instruction
- Evidence of primary language support in the form of displays, posters, charts, bulletin boards
- Evidence of the development of multicultural awareness or pride through pictures, posters, books, magazines, color schemes or maps.

On the basis of focused morning observations, we found that the most common subject area for all sample classrooms was language arts; the most common grouping was whole group instruction; the most common student language mode was listening (followed by speaking); most language production had an academic purpose, and English was the predominant language for instruction, support and children's oral production.

When we reviewed the site summaries and teacher interviews, we found that many of the teachers (some bilingual teachers and all monolingual English speakers) relied on paraeducators for L_1 clarification. Classroom discourse was conducted largely in English and L_1 was used principally with newcomers. Overall, teachers agreed that everything needed to be taught at a much slower pace with much repetition. Teachers tended to rely most on oral instruction.

With respect to our hypothesis about teachers tailoring their instruction to the needs of their ELL students, the data indicated that, in most cases, teachers did attempt to modify their oral language to make themselves better understood by ELLs. However, when asked if they had modified their strategies, some of the more experienced Model A teachers affirmed that all children need language development support and that they had not modified their instruction specifically for the ELLs in their classes. Some grouping by ELD levels occurred; however, there was little documentation regarding differentiated instruction between ELD levels.

The observational data illustrate that teachers used SDAIE (to varying degrees). The following strategies were particularly evident:

- Development of listening skills
- Modeling second language
- Oral language development (story telling, nursery rhymes, songs and plays)
- Vocabulary building
- Print rich environment
- Repetition
- Total Physical Response (TPR)
- Use of realia
- Visual cues

There was less evidence of:

- Connection to prior knowledge and experience
- Guided reading and writing
- Pre-teaching
- Thematic teaching
- Interaction
- Organization and chunking of content
- Shared reading
- Shared writing
- CLOZE activities.

The working hypothesis relating to a comprehensive and explicit English oral-language development program was not borne out by the observations. Specific ESL or ELD lessons were rarely observed, however, this may be due to the fact that most observations were conducted during the morning, the time usually reserved for language arts. By the same token, since observations were conducted during scheduled language arts activities, there was ample evidence of teaching which included strategies for phonemic awareness, comprehensible vocabulary development, and print awareness.

With regard to teacher attitudes about implementing the Structured English Immersion intervention, there appeared to be a great deal of confusion as to the definition and implementation of Structured English Immersion, Model A and Model B. Some teachers stated

that they did not know the difference between the two, others said that they had not altered their teaching strategies since before Structured English Immersion Model A and B was implemented, and some teachers discussed the problematic lack of resources and training to assist them to provide quality services to ELLs. One area in which teachers almost universally agreed was that parents did not and could not help their offspring with their homework. While not all teachers attribute poor student academic performance, it was clear that the district may have to strengthen its efforts to empower parents and engage them in their children's learning experience.

C. Research Question # 2 : Are there differences between practices and curriculum in Structured English Immersion Models A and B?

This section highlights the differences between Models A and B with respect to demographics, classroom environments, teacher attitudes, and teaching strategies.

Demographic differences: Model differences between A and B were noted in: teacher ethnicity, bilingual credential and teacher authorization to teach ELLs (A level, BCLAD, CLAD/LDS, and SB1969). With respect to ethnicity, we found that more than one-half of the White teachers in the sample provided services to classrooms comprised of Model A or predominantly Model A students. Whites made up about 27% of the Model B or predominantly Model B classrooms ELLs. Conversely, Latino teachers taught in about 10% of the Model A or predominantly Model A classrooms and 58% of the Model B or predominantly Model B classrooms.

Exhibit X - Ethnicity by Observed Model

	Exclusively A	Largely A	Equal A & B	Largely B	Exclusively B	W	Total
ASIAN	8	7	1	9	3	1	29
BLACK	7	3		2	1		13
LATINO	3	3		25	33	7	71
WHITE	19	13	4	17	10	1	64
TOTAL	37	26	5	53	47	9	177

Chi-Square Pearson Test of Significance p< .001

Significantly greater numbers of teachers who provided services to children in Model B classrooms (56%) possessed Bilingual Credentials than did teachers providing services to children placed in Model A classrooms (11%).

Exhibit XI - Bilingual Credential by Observed Model

	Exclusively A	Largely A	Equal A & B	Largely B	Exclusively B	W	Total
Yes	2	2	0	25	31	5	65
No	35	24	5	28	16	5	112
TOTAL	37	26	5	53	47	9	177

Chi-Square Pearson Test of Significance p< .001

Looking at authorization, approximately forty percent (40%) of those teachers in exclusively Model A or largely Model A classrooms had no authorization to teach ELLs[10]. Twenty percent (20%) of teachers in exclusively and largely Model B classrooms had no authorization to teach ELLs. Seventy-two percent (72%) of Model B teachers had either BCLAD or the A-level authorizations. Model A teachers were more likely to possess CLAD/LDS or the SB 1969 authorization than were Model B teachers.

Exhibit XII - Authorization by Classroom Composition Model

	Exclusively A	Largely A	Equal A & B	Largely B	Exclusively B	W	Total
A Level	1	4		9	13	6	33
BCLAD	1	1		25	25	2	54
CLAD/LDS	18	7	3	5	1		34
SB 1969	5	1	2	1			9
No Authorization	12	13		13	8	1	46
Total	37	26	5	53	47	9	177

Chi-Square Pearson Test of Significance p< .001

There were no significant differences between the models on variables such as teachers with emergency permits, teacher years of service to the district or teacher years of service to the school. However, in looking closely at the proportion of ELLs assigned to Model A versus Model B classrooms, our analysis indicated that not only did Model A classrooms have significantly fewer ELLs than did the Model B classrooms, but the mean number of ELLs in Exclusively Model A classrooms was 6 and, in Largely Model A classrooms, the mean number of ELLs was 12. In contrast, in Exclusively Model B and Largely Model B classrooms, the mean number of ELLs was 16. Furthermore, ELD Level 1 students were significantly overrepresented in Model B classrooms. The composition of a Model A or B classroom will have an impact on a teacher's structured English instructional approaches, and may have an impact on the speed with which ELLs attain their second languages.

Classroom Environment: With respect to the difference in the classroom environment between the provision of services under Model A or B, we found there were no significant differences in seating arrangements, instructional resources, learning centers, or in environmental evidence of student work, language development and primary language support.

Teacher Attitudes and Teaching Strategies: Teachers serving predominantly Model A designated students rarely provided L1 support and we did not observe bilingual paraeducators in every classroom, however this could have been a function of the time of day in which observation were conducted. Some bilingual teachers believed that if they were teaching in Model A classrooms,

[10] Again, teachers who had no state authorization may have been in-training or taking classes toward state authorization.

they couldn't "mention a word in Spanish." As stated previously, teachers relied on sheltered English strategies such as Total Physical Response (TPR), slower pacing, visuals, and the use of realia.

> *Marilena says, "I went to the park to play two times, too." "Two times two?" says one of the boys, playing with words. Mr. Grant laughs and goes to the board to write*
>
> I went to the park.
> I went to the park, too.
> I went to the park two times.
> I went to the park two times, too.
>
> *Someone says, "for four," and Mr. Grant responds, "More word play. When you write your sentences, would it be fun to write both words in the same sentence? That would be a challenge, wouldn't it?" The children agree that they would like this.*

We found that monolingual English speaking teachers often had no previous experience with ELLs and in some cases, they were observed discouraging L_1 speaking or reading.

> *Ms. Mathews calls all the first graders to the rug. Then Cathy tells the teacher that she likes to read, "I like to read stories." Ms. Mathews agrees that she loves to read also. Then Cathy says that sometimes her grandmother brings her a book in Spanish. Ms. Mathews asks from where and Cathy says from El Salvador. Ms. Mathews tells Cathy she wants her to wait until third-grade to read in Spanish because the vowels are very different. Martin, "I can talk in Spanish." Andrew says, "Spanish is hard." Ms. Mathews reiterates that she does not want the children to try to learn to read in Spanish until third-grade because the vowels are so different.*

In looking at the working hypotheses, we expected to see greater use of primary language support in Model B or Model B prevalent classrooms than we did in Model A or Model A prevalent classrooms. We found that teachers in classrooms largely comprised of children designated for Model B instructional services provided more clarification, perhaps because they felt they had more freedom to clarify or because they had the language skills to clarify in L_1.

> *Mr. Gomez, "Escribe tu nombre, por favor." [Write, your name, please]*
>
> *Monica to Benjamin, "Escribe tu nombre, vas a poner tu nombre, vas a poner glue." [Write your name, you're going to put your name, you're going to put glue]*
>
> *Mr. Gomez, "Victor, you have some work to finish also."*
>
> *Then the entire class follows Mr. Gomez in reading a chart of short A words*
>
> ban, map, can, mad, cat

man, cab, rag, cat, lap
ham, bat, tap, jam, fan,

Mr. Gomez uses TPR for lap (pat own lap on body), tap (tap the table) and fan, "Say abanico," then he and the students fan themselves

beg, bed, bet, Ben
sip, win, rip, tin, hip, sin
rob, hop, rod, hog, rot, hod
hut, sun, cup, but, rug

Mr. Gomez, "What does rip mean?" In using TPR for rod, he acts out fishing. When he asks about the word hog, Maribel says, "That's a mother pig." Mr. Gomez corrects her, "Then no es un cerdo." [Then it's not a hog]

Indeed, when we reviewed the Classroom Summaries for the observational sample, we found significant differences between Model B or Model B prevalent classrooms and Model A or Model A prevalent classrooms in both primary language support[11] and in English Language Development instruction.[12] (See Exhibits XIII and XIV).

Exhibit XIII - Primary Language Support

Classroom Composition Model	Exclusively A	Largely A	Equal A & B	Largely B	Exclusively B	W	Total
Never observed	20	13	4	15	7		59
Occasionally observed	4	5		22	21	3	55
Frequently observed		1		3	6	1	11
Total	24	19	4	34	40	4	125

Chi-Square Pearson Test of Significance p< .001

[11] While we did not observe many instances of primary language support in either Model A or B classrooms, the differences between Model A and B classrooms were notable.

[12] As our focus was language arts and our observations occurred in the morning, we may have missed ELD instruction when it did occur. However, on the basis of what we did observe, ELD occurred more frequently in Model B classrooms.

Exhibit XIV- English Language Development

Classroom Composition Model	Exclusively A	Largely A	Equal A & B	Largely B	Exclusively B	W	Total
Never observed	22	18	4	28	17	1	90
Occasionally observed	1	1		12	16	2	32
Frequently observed	1				1	1	3
Total	24	19	4	34	40	4	125

Chi-Square Pearson Test of Significance p< .001

No significant differences between Model B or Model B prevalent classrooms and Model A or Model A prevalent classrooms were observed for the other instructional practices noted including:

- Cooperative and collaborative work
- Whole group instruction
- Small group instruction
- Individual work
- Differentiated instruction
- Individualized tutoring
- Learning centers
- Sustained silent reading
- Oral reading
- Writing and composition
- Oral speech production
- Listening practice
- Formal assessment
- Alternative assessment
- Student self-assessment
- Experiential learning

With respect to teacher accommodation to the needs of the ELLs designated as predominantly Model A, or predominantly Model B, Exhibit XV further demonstrates that much more language support was afforded to children receiving Model B services than were receiving Model A services. Model B children also received significantly more ESL instruction and were more frequently grouped in pairs than were their counterparts who were placed in largely Model A programs. We also saw more evidence of the intermingling of both languages in Model B classrooms than we did in Model A classrooms.

Exhibit XV - Classroom Interaction Structures

Predominantly A	Predominantly B
	ESL/ELD Instruction*
	Pair groupings**
	Primary language support from teacher*
	Primary language support from paraeducators*
	Paraprofessional use of both L_1L_2*
	Child use of both L_1L_2*

**Chi-Square Pearson Test of Significance p< .05 ** Chi-Square Pearson Test of Significance p< .001*

Thus, on the basis of the instruments measuring classroom interaction structures, our research indicates that Model B staff are providing more direct instruction to students in L_1. Further the incidence of language intermingling is higher in Model B classrooms. The predominance of language intermingling in Model B over Model A classrooms may be due to the comfort level experienced by staff and children with respect to speaking both languages within the classroom environment. The L_1L_2 category does not specify whether or not the speaker was intermingling languages or code-switching,[13] however, it bears careful examination and further research into the acquisition of English by young ELLs in the district because L_1L_2 use by children signifies an important phase of second language acquisition.

Genishi (1976), in her study of bilingual kindergartners' code switching and code choice, noted that the language choice of young children is mainly determined by the language ability of their conversational partners. These six-year-old bilinguals were able to sustain a conversation in either language, or to switch between the two as the conversation participants required. Code switching, then, for young children is motivated by a desire to accommodate, not to emphasize a point or to mark ethnic identity. McLaughlin (1995) reviews the research and reports that "[y]ounger children mix languages to resolve ambiguities and clarify statements, but older children and adults typically switch codes (or languages) to convey social meanings"(cited from Hammink, 2000).

The two remaining hypotheses to be addressed in this section are:

- Students who receive Model A services will be exposed to more English language instruction than will students who receive Model B services.

---

[13] Code-switching is the use of two languages simultaneously or interchangeably (Valdes-Fallis, 1977). It implies some degree of competence in the two languages even if bilingual fluency is not yet stable.

- As a result of this exposure, students who receive Model A services will have greater access to an English language curriculum than will students who receive Model B services

While the research has demonstrated a significant increase in primary language support in Model B over Model A classes (as would be expected given the definitions of the models), we have not observed significantly greater use of English in Model A over Model B classrooms. Rather, the language heard most often in both models was English. However, there were significantly more teacher and student utterances relating to instruction and routines in Model A classrooms. Further in-depth analysis will be needed to understand the implication of this finding, especially as it relates to student gains. In addition, Model A teachers and students talked about discipline and behavior more often than did teachers and students in Model B. This is possibly a function of children understanding less about what was going on in the classroom and, therefore, being less involved or engaged. It could also be a function of those children, having learned some English, being more verbal than their peers from Model B classrooms. Lastly, Model B children exhibited significantly greater numbers of non-verbal behaviors than did their Model A counterparts. This may be explained by the lower ELD levels of Model B children at program outset or by cultural prescriptions for interactional styles, but again, further in-depth analysis will be called for at this time.

The next section of this report examines student outcomes according to model, teacher experience and certification and by student ELD level. The analysis includes only the scores for English learners in those 177 classrooms included in the field data collection.

D. Research Question # 3: What is the impact of Model A and Model B interventions on student outcomes?

This question related to the difference in academic outcomes (as evidenced by SAT/9 scores in reading and language arts, and ELD levels) between students of Model A and Model B classrooms as well as the impact of Structured English Immersion on student achievement overall. Normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores for the Spring 1999 and Spring 2000 administrations of the Stanford 9 Achievement Test and matched NCE gains for each group discussed below are presented in Appendix G.

Matched individual student gains are the most precise indicators of student growth. Matched gains represent actual student growth from one year to the next and are better indicators than percentile changes since aggregate percentile scores can be influenced by changes in student composition from one year to the next. Gain scores presented in the following text (exhibits and discussion) include actual matched NCE gains, expected matched NCE gains, and adjusted matched NCE gains.

Adjusted gain scores were used to control for initial Stanford 9 differences between English Language Learners (ELLs) served in Model A versus Model B. They were calculated in the following manner:

- Five performance groups (quintiles) were computed for 1999 reading and language scores districtwide for ELLs in Grades 2 and 3 (see Table XVI).

- Actual NCE gain scores, measuring Stanford 9 performance between 1999 and 2000, were calculated for each individual student by subject and grade.

- Each district quintile average gain score was calculated and became the expected average gain score for ELLs who correspond to that quintile. That is, each student is expected, on average, to make achievement gains similar to those of students in their respective quintile.

- Each student's expected quintile score was subtracted from the actual gain score to calculate the adjusted gain score.

Table XVI
District Gains for ELLs (Spring 1999 to Spring 2000 by Initial NCE Quintile)

Grade 2	Quintile 1	Quintile 2	Quintile 3	Quintile 4	Quintile 5
Reading	7.0 (N=3,592)	2.5 (N=5,046)	-0.1 (N=4,398)	-1.9 (N=4,423)	-7.9 (N=4,628)
Language	9.1 (N=3,896)	3.5 (N=5,148)	1.6 (N=3,678)	0.3 (N=5,545)	-4.4 (N=5,605)
Grade 3					
Reading	7.4 (N=3,174)	3.1 (N=4,914)	2.1 (N=4,865)	1.3 (N=4,263)	-2.9 (N=4,415)
Language	16.7 (N=4,435)	10.7 (N=4,309)	7.0 (N=4,127)	3.8 (N=4,805)	-4.0 (N=5,080)

Table XVI shows that students in the lower quintiles had greater Spring 1999 to Spring 2000 average NCE gains than students in the upper quintiles. That is, ELLs in the upper quintiles made progressively smaller gains than their peers in the lower quintiles. Based on these year-to-year gains, we would therefore expect the lower scoring ELLs to show the greatest Spring 1999 to Spring 2000 gains.

Model comparisons: Exhibit XVII shows the actual gains of the Model A and Model B samples compared with the adjusted gains. The actual Grade 2 reading gain for ELLs in Model A was 0.9 NCE points, from 38.5 in 1999 to 39.4 in 2000 (See Appendix G). However, the average adjusted reading gain was 1.9 NCE points. This means that the actual gain score of 0.9 also exceeded the expected gain score by nearly 2 NCE points. In contrast, second-grade English Learners in Model B also gained 0.9 NCE points, from 33.1 to 33.9. But their actual gain of nearly 1 NCE point exceeded the expected score by 0.5, 1.4 NCE points less than for students in Model A.

Exhibit XVII - Actual Gains and Adjusted Gains by Model

	Reading		Language	
	Actual Gains	Adjusted Gains	Actual Gains	Adjusted Gains
Grade 2				
ELLs (Model A)	**0.9** (n=190)	**1.9** (n=190)	**4.3** (n=201)	**2.9** (n=201)
ELLs (Model B)	**0.9** (n=455)	**0.5** (n=455)	**0.8** (n=483)	**-1.1** (n=483)
Grade 3				
ELLs (Model A)	**2.4** (n=159)	**1.0** (n=159)	**7.8** (n=162)	**2.0** (n=162)
ELLs (Model B)	**2.9** (n=382)	**1.0** (n=382)	**6.9** (n=410)	**0.2** (n=410)

As can be noted in Appendix G, the average 1999 score of 33.1 NCEs for Model B students in Grade 2, compared with the 1999 score of 38.5 for Model A students, indicates that a greater proportion of ELLs in Model B were in the lower quintiles. Therefore, as Exhibit XVI illustrated, students in the lower quintiles were expected to make greater gains, on average, than those in the higher quintiles. However, Exhibit XVII shows that second graders in Model A made greater adjusted gains than their Model B counterparts in reading and language.

Appendix G shows that students in Model B had slightly larger year-to-year Grade 3 NCE reading gains (2.9) than those in Model A (2.4). However, when gains are adjusted by initial reading score), ELLs in both Model A and Model B had identical adjusted gains of 1.0 NCE points (see Exhibit XVII). With respect to language, Grade 3 Model A ELLs also had greater adjusted gains (2.0) than did Model B students (0.2).

In summary, Grade 2 Model A adjusted gains are greater than Model B adjusted gains in reading and language, and in Grade 3 language. However, Model A third graders did not outperform their Model B peers in reading, rather the adjusted gains for both Model A and Model B third graders were the same.

Comparisons between Models in Practice: Exhibit XVIII shows the actual and adjusted NCE gains for ELLs in classrooms designated as Model A or Model B. A classroom was designated as Model A if the majority of ELLs assigned to that classroom were Model A students. A classroom was identified as Model B if the majority of ELLs assigned to that classroom were Model B students. In reading, ELLs in Grade 2 Model A classrooms had greater adjusted gains (2.7) than students in Model B classrooms (0.9). Similarly in language, ELLs in Grade 2 Model A classrooms also had greater adjusted gains (3.9 vs -0.3) than students in Model B classrooms.

In Grade 3 reading, ELLs in Model B classrooms had greater adjusted gains (1.4 vs. 0.5) than those in Model A classrooms. The opposite findings were observed for language, where students in Model A classrooms had greater adjusted gains (3.0 vs. 0.3) than their Model B counterparts.

Exhibit XVIII - Actual and Adjusted Gains by Model in Practice

	Reading		Language	
	Actual Gains	**Adjusted Gains**	**Actual Gains**	**Adjusted Gains**
Model A Classrooms (Grade 2)	**0.8** (n=155)	**2.7** (n=155)	**4.4** (n=160)	**3.9** (n=160)
Model B Classrooms (Grade 2)	**1.2** (n=442)	**0.9** (n=442)	**1.8** (n=475)	**-0.3** (n=475)
Model A Classrooms (Grade 3)	**1.8** (n=130)	**0.5** (n=130)	**9.9** (n=135)	**3.0** (n=135)
Model B Classrooms (Grade 3)	**3.3** (n=368)	**1.4** (n=368)	**6.8** (n=394)	**0.3** (n=394)

Comparisons by ELD Levels: Exhibit XIX presents the Stanford 9 results controlling for ELD levels. The overall trends between ELD Levels were identical for Grade 2 reading and language and Grade 3 reading and language. ELLs in both Model A and Model B in the higher ELD levels (ELD 4-5) had greater adjusted NCE gains in reading and language. That is, after controlling for initial Spring 1999 reading and language scores, students most proficient in English (higher ELD levels) made greater gains.

Model A students (Grades 2 and 3) in ELD Level 1-3 made greater adjusted gains than their Model B counterparts in reading and language. Model A students (ELD Level 4-5) made greater adjusted gains than their Model B peers in Grade 2 reading and language, and Grade 3 language. Students in Model B (ELD Level 4-5) made greater gains in Grade 3 reading.

Exhibit XIX - Actual and Adjusted Student Gains Controlling for ELD Level

Grade 2		Reading		Language	
		Actual Gains	Adjusted Gains	Actual Gains	Adjusted Gains
Model A	ELD 1-3	1.2 (n=166)	1.7 (n=166)	3.7 (n=177)	1.9 (n=177)
	ELD 4-5	-1.4 (n=24)	3.3 (n=24)	9.4 (n=24)	10.4 (n=24)
Model B	ELD 1-3	1.4 (n=421)	0.4 (n=421)	0.6 (n=446)	-1.4 (n=446)
	ELD 4-5	0.2 (n=34)	1.2 (n=34)	2.3 (n=37)	2.6 (n=37)
Grade 3					
Model A	ELD 1-3	2.7 (n=113)	0.8 (n=113)	8.5 (n=116)	1.4 (n=116)
	ELD 4-5	1.5 (n=46)	1.4 (n=46)	6.1 (n=46)	3.4 (n=46)
Model B	ELD 1-3	2.3 (n=284)	0 (n=284)	7.0 (n=307)	-0.7 (n=307)
	ELD 4-5	4.8 (n=27)	4.1 (n=27)	6.7 (n=102)	3.0 (n=102)

Comparisons by Teacher Credentialing: Exhibit XX depicts the actual and adjusted gains, respectively, for reading and language controlling for teacher credentialing. More specifically, credentialed teachers were compared with colleagues holding an emergency teaching permit. For Grade 2 reading and language, ELLs in both Model A and Model B who studied with credentialed teachers made greater adjusted gains than their peers who studied with teachers holding emergency permits. Moreover, students in Model A with credentialed teachers made greater adjusted gains than Model B students with credentialed teachers in both reading and language.

In Grade 3 Model B reading and language, the adjusted gains favored students who studied with credentialed teachers (See Exhibit XX). Similar to the other analyses presented in these pages, Model B third graders who studied with credentialed teachers, exhibited greater adjusted gains in reading (1.8) than Model A students who studied with credentialed teachers (0.2). The pattern is reversed in language with the Model A students taught by credentialed teachers (2.1) outperforming the Model B students taught by credentialed teachers (1.2).

Exhibit XX - Actual and Adjusted Student Gains Controlling for Credential Status

Grade 2	Reading		Language	
	Actual Gain	Adjusted Gain	Actual Gain	Adjusted Gain
Model A				
Emergency Permit	**-0.7** (n=34)	**-1.3** (n=34)	**0.4** (n=36)	**-2.1** (n=36)
Credential	**1.9** (n=112)	**3.0** (n=112)	**6.4** (n=115)	**5.3** (n=115)
Model B				
Emergency Permit	**0** (=118)	**-0.5** (n=118)	**-0.4** (n=124)	**-1.9** (n=124)
Credential	**2.1** (n=249)	**2.2** (n=249)	**2.2** (n=259)	**0.9** (n=259)
Grade 3				
Model A				
Emergency Permit	*	*	*	*
Credential	**1.6** (n=123)	**0.2** (n=123)	**8.1** (n=125)	**2.1** (n=125)
Model B				
Emergency Permit	**4.0** (n=48)	**1.0** (n=48)	**11.1** (n=54)	**0.5** (n=54)
Credential	**3.6** (n=260)	**1.8** (n=260)	**7.5** (n=291)	**1.2** (n=291)

* *Actual and adjusted gains were not reported here due to the small sample size.*

Comparisons by Teacher Authorization: Exhibits XXI and XXII depict the adjusted reading and language gains for Grade 2 and Grade 3, respectively, by teacher authorization. Grade 2 Model A gains are difficult to interpret, given the small cell sizes for each authorization group. For Model B, students with CLAD/LDS teachers had the greatest adjusted gains in reading, while students with BCLAD teachers had the largest gains in language.

Exhibit XXI - Actual and Adjusted Gains by Teacher Authorization (Grade 2)

Grade 2	Reading		Language	
Model A	Actual Gains	Adjusted Gains	Actual Gains	Adjusted Gains
BCLAD	*	*	*	*
CLAD/LDS	0.2 (n=64)	1.5 (n=64)	5.1 (n=64)	4.2 (n=64)
SB1969	*	*	*	*
A Level	-0.5 (n=31)	0.1 (n=31)	0.9 (n=33)	-1.2 (n=33)
No Authorization	2.0 (n=31)	2.3 (n=31)	6.8 (n=36)	3.7 (n=36)
Model B				
BCLAD	1.8 (n=142)	1.6 (n=142)	4.1 (n=148)	2.4 (n=148)
CLAD/LDS	2.0 (n=32)	2.7 (n=32)	1.0 (n=34)	0.4 (n=34)
SB1969	*	*	*	*
A Level	1.8 (n=155)	1.6 (n=155)	0.3 (n=155)	-1.5 (n=155)
No Authorization	-2.4 (n=74)	-2.9 (n=74)	0.5 (n=93)	-1.8 (n=93)

* *Actual and adjusted gains were not reported here due to the small sample size.*

Exhibit XXII - Actual and Adjusted Gains by Teacher Authorization

Grade 3	Reading		Language	
Model A	Actual Gains	Adjusted Gains	Actual Gains	Adjusted Gains
BCLAD	*	*	*	*
CLAD/LDS	1.5 (n=74)	0.3 (n=74)	9.7 (n=76)	3.9 (n=76)
SB1969	*	*	*	*
A Level	*	*	*	*
No Authorization	2.1 (n=50)	0.3 (n=50)	6.3 (n=51)	-0.6 (n=51)
Model B				
BCLAD	3.5 (n=197)	1.8 (n=197)	7.6 (n=212)	1.2 (n=212)
CLAD/LDS	0.1 (n=48)	-0.8 (n=48)	3.2 (n=51)	1.6 (n=51)
SB1969	*	*	*	*
A Level	5.2 (n=63)	2.4 (n=63)	8.2 (n=68)	-0.4 (n=68)
No Authorization	2.5 (n=44)	0.1 (n=44)	8.0 (n=49)	-1.3 (n=49)

* *Actual and adjusted gains were not reported here due to the small sample size.*

In Grade 3 Model A, authorization results are more difficult to interpret due to low cell sizes. Model B students with A-Level Fluency and BCLAD teachers made the greatest adjusted reading gains. In Grade 3 language, Model B students with BCLAD and CLAD/LDS teachers made the greatest adjusted gains.

Overall, Exhibits XXI and XXII demonstrate that state/district authorization of teachers does have an impact on student outcomes. For example, Model B students of teachers holding no state

or district authorization achieved largely negative or very small positive (0.1) adjusted gains in reading and language. This highlights the importance of authorization when addressing the needs of ELL students.

Exhibit XXIII illustrates the ELD progress made by ELLs from one year to the next for both groups of students (children designated to receive Model A services and children designated to receive Model B services) As shown below, ELLs from both groups exhibited similarities with respect to their ELD progress. (The California Department of Education defines meeting progress as advancing at least one ELD level from one year to the next.) The far right column confirms that for students starting at ELD Level 1, 75.6% showed at least one year ELD growth in Model A versus 73.5% in Model B, indicating essentially no difference between the Models for entering ELD Level I students. However, the results for the combined initial ELD levels 1-3 appear to show an advantage for Model A by approximately 12 percentage points. In addition, among the ELD Level 4s, a higher percentage of Model A children progressed to ELD level 5 or redesignated than did Model B children.

IV. Conclusions

A. Summary

This evaluation focused on the instructional services provided to English Language Learners (ELLs) enrolled in Structured English Immersion first, second and third grade classrooms. The legislation regarding class size and the delivery of structured English immersion has created a number of challenges for educators of ELLs. We found that, as might be expected, it was not uncommon for sample classrooms to consist of a mixture of different grade levels (more than 16%), a mixture of children assigned to different Structured English Immersion instructional models (more than 50%), and a mixture of children with three or more different ELD levels (more than 50%).

The predominant language of instruction was English with listening, oral reading, oral speech production and writing most often observed. Overall, classroom observers saw very few English language development lessons and experiential hands-on learning activities and little evidence of primary language support. Most classrooms were devoid of primary language materials or any materials reflecting the children's ethnic or cultural heritage. When evidence of primary language materials was observed, it was only in the form of books. Many of the teachers (some bilingual teachers and all monolingual English speakers) relied on paraeducators for L_1 clarification. Classroom discourse was conducted largely in English and L_1 was used principally with children entering with low ELD levels. Overall, teachers agreed that everything needed to be taught at a much slower pace with much repetition. Teachers tended to rely on oral instruction.

There was a great deal of confusion with respect to the definition and implementation of Structured English Immersion, Model A and Model B, and teachers discussed the lack of

Exhibit XXIII

Yearly ELD Progress from 1999-2000 by Model Controlling for Initial ELD Level

Model A Program

ELD Level Began in Fall 99	ELLs	ELD Level Ending in Spring 2000										Students Redesignated			
	Number	ELD 1		ELD 2		ELD 3		ELD 4		ELD 5		RFEP*		Met ELD Progress**	
ELD 1	82	20	24.4%	32	39.0%	27	32.9%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%	2	2.4%	62	75.6%
ELD 2	270			140	51.9%	122	45.2%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	6	2.2%	130	48.1%
ELD 3	233					164	70.4%	37	15.9%	1	0.4%	31	13.3%	69	29.6%
ELD 4	69							44	63.8%	4	5.8%	21	30.4%	25	36.2%
ELD 5	8									5	62.5%	3	37.5%	3	37.5%
TOTAL**	662	20	3.0%	172	26.0%	313	47.3%	82	12.4%	12	1.8%	63	9.5%	289	43.7%

*RFEP–Redesignated Fluent English Proficient. **The California Dept. of Education defines meeting progress as advancing as least one (1) ELD level from one year to the next.

Model B Program

ELD Level Began in Fall 99	ELLs	ELD Level Ending Spring 2000										Students Redesignated			
	Number	ELD 1		ELD 2		ELD 3		ELD 4		ELD 5		RFEP*		Met ELD Progress**	
ELD 1	302	80	26.5%	163	54.0%	45	14.9%	4	1.3%	1	0.3%	9	3.0%	222	73.5%
ELD 2	842			473	56.2%	295	35.0%	41	4.9%	5	0.6%	28	3.3%	369	43.8%
ELD 3	431					331	76.8%	55	12.8%	1	0.2%	44	10.2%	100	23.2%
ELD 4	66							53	80.3%	0	0.0%	13	19.7%	13	19.7%
ELD 5	6									4	0.0%	2	0.0%	2	33.3%
TOTAL**	1,647	80	4.9%	636	38.6%	671	40.7%	153	9.3%	11	0.7%	96	5.8%	706	42.9%

*RFEP–Redesignated Fluent English Proficient. **The California Dept. of Education defines meeting progress as advancing as least one (1) ELD level from one year to the next.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

resources and training to assist them provide quality services to ELLs. In general, students continue to use their primary language with each other, particularly in non-academic interaction settings.

One area in which teachers almost universally agreed was that parents did not and could not help their offspring with their homework. While not all teachers attributed student difficulties to the lack of parent participation, it was clear that parents were less able to help children with homework in Structured English Immersion than they had been in bilingual education and that district efforts to address parent education and parent involvement need to be continued.

With respect to model implementation, significant differences favored Model B classrooms in English language development activities, ESL instruction, primary language support, pair groupings, code-switching and the use of L_1 in the classroom. Teachers serving predominantly Model A designated students rarely provided L_1 support; instead, they relied on sheltered English strategies such as TPR, slower pace, visuals, and the use of realia. There were significantly more teacher and student utterances relating to instruction and routines in Model A classrooms, and Model A teachers and students talked about discipline and behavior more often than did teachers and students in Model B classrooms. Lastly, Model B children exhibited significantly greater numbers of non-verbal behaviors than did their Model A counterparts.

In looking closely at the proportion of ELLs assigned to Model A versus Model B classrooms, our analysis indicated that not only did Model A classrooms have significantly fewer ELLs than did the Model B classrooms, but ELD Level 1 students were significantly overrepresented in Model B classrooms. The composition of a Model A or B classroom may have a great impact on a teacher's ability to provide sound structured English instruction.

With respect to the achievement gains, Model A students generally outperformed Model B students with the exception of third grade reading in which Model B students outperformed Model A students. The results held even when controlling for classroom composition and teacher credentialing. With respect to progress through the different ELD levels, the results slightly favored Model A.

B. Implications

The implications of our findings regarding the implementation of Structured English Immersion fall largely in the areas of classroom composition, communication, and training. The more heterogeneous the class (grade, instructional model, ELD level, languages), the greater the challenge for the teacher to differentiate instruction. Widespread confusion about the definition and implementation of Models A and B has resulted in uneven implementation of Structured English Immersion. Teachers' perceptions regarding Proposition 227, school language policy, the district Reading Plan, and their role as English language models versus their role as providers of L_1 support to ensure student understanding results in a wide range of teacher behaviors that are not necessarily model driven.

The role of parents is a very important issue to be addressed. Research regarding the impact of parent involvement on student achievement suggests further and increased efforts to include parents as active partners in their children's education is justified.

Further research and analysis will focus on discovering why, given greater support in the students' primary language by Model B teachers, are Model A second graders exhibiting greater gains on measures of achievement and ELD progress. Further investigation will also be warranted to provide an explanation for Model B outcomes in third grade. The reading skills called for by the Stanford 9 tests range from recall and decoding in first grade to inference, analysis, and the drawing of conclusions in third grade. Does the greater L_1 support received by Model B students result in their greater comprehension skills or is their performance on the Grade 3 reading a result of their previous experience in bilingual education? Did three years in bilingual education (Grades K, 1 and 2) give third graders a strong foundation in reading? Did a greater percentage of Model B third graders come rom a bilingual education background than did Model A third graders?

The child outcome data will have to be further analyzed controlling for the proportion of ELLs to English speakers, classroom compositional differences, the students' academic experiences prior to inclusion in the evaluation sample (i.e., placement in Structured English Immersion versus bilingual education classes), and the inclusion of ELLs who were observed, but who redesignated prior to the test date and were, therefore, excluded from the analysis.

It is also important to probe more deeply into the observational data in order to glean insights and understanding about the following issues: teacher/student discourse (student opportunity for oral language expression and practice); the process by which ELLs acquire English skills; the interaction between English language learning and English literacy; and the interaction between model designation and other factors such as classroom composition, and teacher training and comfort with Structured English Immersion. Research in Year II will also focus on the extent to which teachers are able to accommodate (adapt/extend/supplement) Open Court lessons to meet the needs of ELLs; evidence of SDAIE as implemented throughout the curriculum and the impact of SDAIE on student outcomes; the impact of peer language on ELD progress; how information regarding ELL curricula, accommodations and placement is disseminated throughout the district and parent understanding of and reactions to Structured English Immersion, Models A and B.

APPENDIX A
DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Program Evaluation and Research Branch
Language Acquisition Unit

Evaluation of the Implementation of Structured English Immersion, 1999-2000
Classroom Observation Instrument

_____ Site Number

_____ Observer Number

_____ Class Number

_____ Date

_____ Grade

_____ Program Model

Front

Back

Indicate the room environment including arrangement of student desks, teacher desk, learning centers, library/book resources, computer/s, sinks, and other instructional equipment. Note any features unique to the instructional pattern of the room. If observation of instruction is occurring in a location other than the classroom setting, provide an annotated sketch of the instructional environment.

Classroom Environment Scan

A **Seating Arrangements** (check as many as apply)

_____ rows of tables/desks facing front of room
_____ circle/semi-circle of tables/desks
_____ clusters or pods of tables/desks
_____ individual tables/desks
_____ rug area
_____ other: (describe)

B **Instructional Resources** (check as many as apply)

_____ book displays
_____ class library
_____ maps/globes
_____ other: (describe)

_____ reference books
_____ chalkboard
_____ puzzles/games

_____ magazines
_____ feltboards
_____ live animals

_____ computers: (indicate type and quantity)

_____ audio-visual equipment: (indicate type and quantity)

C **Instructional Centers** (check as many as apply)

_____ reading
_____ music
_____ science
_____ other: (describe)

_____ writing
_____ art
_____ social studies

_____ listening
_____ math
_____ none

D **Evidence of Student Activities** (check as many as apply)

_____ group projects
_____ reports
_____ murals
_____ puppet shows
_____ letter writing
_____ student-made books
_____ graphic organizers
_____ other: (describe)

_____ story boards
_____ presentations
_____ art projects
_____ journals
_____ map activities
_____ hands-on activities
_____ read-alouds

_____ graphs
_____ collages
_____ experiments
_____ book reports
_____ poetry
_____ surveys
_____ portfolios

E **Evidence of Language Development Instruction** (check as many as apply)

_____ word walls
_____ sentence strips
_____ rhymes
_____ other: (describe)

_____ checklists
_____ poems
_____ story mapping

_____ big books
_____ word charts
_____ pocket charts

F **Evidence of Primary Language (L1) Support** (check as many as apply)

_____ books
_____ displays
_____ other: (describe)

_____ posters
_____ charts

_____ bulletin boards
_____ student work

TIMELINE OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION STRUCTURES *(Please indicate classroom interaction structures at one minute increments)*

SITE: _____ **ROOM:** _____ **VISIT:** _____ **OBSERVER:** _____ **ACTIVITY:** _____

Start Time:		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	Total
Subject areas	Language Arts																															
	ELD																															
	ESL																															
	Other																															
Grouping	Whole																															
	Small																															
	Triad																															
	Pair																															
	Solo																															
Stud Lang Mode	Listening																															
	Speaking																															
	Reading																															
	Writing																															
Lang Content	BICS (Social)																															
	CALPS (Academic)																															
	Classroom Routines																															
	Discipline/ Behavior																															
Lang Instruction	English																															
	Primary																															
	L1/L2																															
Lang of Support	English																															
	Primary																															
	L1/L2																															
Child Language	English																															
	Primary																															
	L1/L2																															

Classroom Oral Production Pattern - COPP (Five Minutes)

Site: Room: Visit #: Observer #: Date:

By:	Type of Utterance	Start time: / End time: / Activity:	Tally
T	Instructions		
E	Routines		
A	Discipline/Behavior		
C	Question		
H	Response		
E	Evaluation		
R	Non-verbal		
	BICS		
	L1 or L2		
S	Instructions		
T	Routines		
U	Discipline/Behavior		
D	Question		
E	Response		
N	Evaluation		
T	Non-verbal		
	BICS		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Observation Summary

At the end of the three-day observation cycle, indicate to what extent each of the following was used or demonstrated.

	None	Some	Extensive
	1	2	3
1. Cooperative / collaborative learning	1	2	3
2. Whole group instruction	1	2	3
3. Small group learning activities	1	2	3
4. Individual work	1	2	3
5. Differentiated instruction (specific needs)	1	2	3
6. Individualized tutoring	1	2	3
7. Learning Centers	1	2	3
8. Sustained silent reading	1	2	3
9. Oral reading opportunities	1	2	3
10. Writing / composition practice	1	2	3
11. Oral speech production opportunities	1	2	3
12. Listening practice opportunities	1	2	3
13. Formal assessment strategies	1	2	3
14. Alternative assessment strategies	1	2	3
15. Student self-assessment strategies	1	2	3
16. Experiential hands-on learning	1	2	3
17. Primary language support	1	2	3
18. Primary language instruction	1	2	3

APPENDIX B
SITE SUMMARY EXAMPLE

Summary Statement

Mr. X is a man from Mexico. He's about 25 years old and he moved the United States when he was 14. He's rather well-organized. The classroom is colorful with pictures all over the walls and the children are doing what they're supposed to be doing. According to Mr. X, that is because he understands the children and he can relate to them having been an immigrant himself. The first day, I visited the classroom, Mr. X had the children on task. There was very little wasted time. Furthermore, I saw him spend very little time disciplining the children. His was a more indirect approach. I often heard him say, "I really like the way a child is facing me. She has her hands in her lap and she's ready to listen." Sometimes, Mr. O made mistakes in English and the kids corrected him. On the second day, the class had a substitute. I was very impressed by the substitute because she took the time to really teach the kids. She was an African-American women around forty years old perhaps. She asked if I could to come back another day, so I went to a different reading teacher, Ms S. She had 20 kids sitting in straight backed chairs in rows for one hour twenty minutes and she tried to do a lesson about contractions. It was pretty much unsuccessful as nobody really understood what she was talking about. Ms. S is also a Mexican-American and spoke Spanish very well and talked to her kids in Spanish. Sometimes, she was not as good with her classroom management as was Mr. X in that the kids were not on task is much. Back in the classroom, the substitute did an ESL lesson with the children. They talked about their favorite holidays and she gave very child a chance to talk. And all the kids are enthusiastic and engaged too.

And on the third day, I observed Mr. T as the reading teacher. His class was not as engaged as Mr. X's class, but they were largely on task. In his class they were learning a story pyramid and he was trying to get them to talk about the four parts of the pyramid.. He had one troublesome child who (as Mr. X he told me) should have been a special education. The reading curriculum (SFA) keeps the kids on task. What I noticed about Success for All, was that it consists of a lot of activities and it keeps the kids pretty much on task most the time as they move quickly from one activity to another. Success for All is very structured and seems to be teacher proof, although I'm not sure that is really the case. Back in Mr. X's, the children were tracing spelling words on each others' backs. When they went the library, it was interesting to see one child choose a Spanish-language book which he could not read very well, but all the children went up to see the book and all were interested in it.

APPENDIX C
CODEBOOK

CODEBOOK, Level 1

	Instructional Practices	Code
Curricular areas	English Language Development	ELD
	English as a Second Language	ESL
	English Language Arts	ELA
	Reading	RD
	Literature	LIT
	Writing	WRT
	Speaking	SPK
	Listening	LST
	Spelling	SP
	Handwriting	HW
	Math	M
	Science	SC
	Social Science	SS
	Health	HL
	Physical Education	PE
	Art	A
	Music	M
	Other	O
Grouping	Whole Class	WC
	Large Group	LG

	Instructional Practices	Code
	Small Group	SG
	Pairs	PR
	Single/Independent	S
	Adult to Student Intervention	1-1
Activity Structure	Instructions	Inst
	Lecture	Lec
	Demonstration	Demo
	Direct	Dir
	Clarification	Clar
	Evaluation/Assessment/Feedback	Eval
	Observation	Obs
	Discipline, Interruption, Transition	Non
	Seatwork	Seat
	Collaborative	Col
	Centers	Ctr
	Performance	Perf
	Paper and Pencil	PP
	Constructavist	Cons
ELD/ELA Mode	Listening	LIS
	Speaking	SPK
	Writing	WRT

53

	Instructional Practices	Code
	Reading	RDG
Language Content	Social Communications	BIC
	Academic Communication	CALP
	Classroom Management - Instructions	CM
	Discipline/Behavior Instruction	DIS
Language of Instruction	Content presented in primary language	L1
	Content presented in English	L2
	Content presented in both primary language and English	L1/L2
Language of support	Primary language support (Code for language and for provider of support - Teacher = T /// Paraeducator = TA ///Adult volunteer = V /// Cross-age tutor = T /// Other student = S)	L1
	English support	L2
	Support in both primary language and English	L1/L2
Discourse patterns	Teacher Question	TQ
	Student Question	SQ
	Student Response	SR
	Teacher Response	TR
	Teacher to Student	TS
	Student to Teacher	ST
	Student to Student	SS
	English	L2
	Primary Language	L1

	Instructional Practices	Code
Hierarchy of thinking - Bloom's Taxonomy	Knowledge (Fact) Comprehension Application	K C Ap
	Analysis	An
	Synthesis	S
	Evaluation	E
SDAIE Classroom Practices: <u>Content</u>	• Major concepts and skills identified	skills
	• Major concepts and skills aligned with standards	standards
	• Lesson delivery supports the objectives and standards	delivery
	• Activities support the objectives and standards	activities
SDAIE Classroom Practices: <u>Connections</u>	• Examples clearly illustrate key points	key
	• Examples link to student experience	experience
	• Visually-rich environments	vr

	Instructional Practices	Code
SDAIE Classroom Practices: ***Connections***	• Print-rich environments	pr
	• Students solve problems	problem
	• Students hypothesize	hypothesize
	• Students organize	organize
	• Students categorize	categorize
	• Students draw conclusions	conclude
	• New learning builds on previous learning	build
	• Scaffolding strategies include outlines, webs and other visual organizers	scaffold
	• Content organized with comprehensible materials and text	comprehensi on
SDAIE Classroom Practices: ***Comprehensibility***	• Teacher speaks clearly	clear
	• Teacher models appropriate academic language use	models
	• New words and idioms taught	vocab
	• New words and idioms written on charts and word walls	written
	• Concrete examples illustrate new terminology	concrete
	• One-to-one correspondence between spoken and written words and phrases	1-to-1
	• Pictures, diagrams and models clearly illustrate concepts	illustrate
	• Teacher checks for comprehension frequently	checks
	• Teacher offers immediate and specific feedback	feedback

	Instructional Practices	Code
SDAIE Classroom Practices: Interaction	• Interactive groups discuss concepts	I-concepts
	• Interactive groups clarify ideas	I-clarify
	• Interactive groups solve problems	I-problems
	• Interactive groups discuss concepts, clarify ideas, solve problems in L1	I-L1
	• Students produce graphs	graphs
	• Students produce charts	charts
	• Students produce outlines	outlines
	• Students produce lists	lists
	• Students produce descriptions	descriptions
	• Students produce essays	essays
	• Students question each other	s?s
	• Students question teacher	s?t
	• Teacher questions student	t?s
	• Students engage in real-life activities	rla
	• Teacher offers opportunities for metacognitive reflection (e.g., dialogue journals, learning logs, note taking)	meta

APPENDIX D
ELD MIXES IN SAMPLE CLASSROOMS

The Combination of Eld Levels per Sample Classroom

ELD LEVELS	Frequency	Percent
1	1	.6
2	4	2.3
3	8	4.5
4	2	1.1
5	2	1.1
1&2	9	5.1
1&3	1	.6
1&5	1	.6
2&3	41	23.2
2&4	2	1.1
2&5	1	.6
3&4	10	5.6
3&5	1	.6
12&3	41	23.2
13&4	2	1.1
23&4	24	13.6
23&5	4	2.3
34&5	3	1.7
123&4	13	7.3
234&5	7	4.0
Total	177	100.0

APPENDIX E

TEACHER AUTHORIZATION TO TEACH E.L.L.S

Appendix E.

Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) - A state authorization to provide specialized instruction to individuals for whom English is a second language. Specifically it authorizes instruction for 1) English Language Development (ELD) in preschool , K-12, and adults (restrictions apply to holders of Children Center Permits, Child Development Permits, and Designated Subjects Teaching Credentials), 2) Specially Designed Academic Instruction Delivered in English (SDAIE) (in the subjects and grade levels authorized by the prerequisite credential or permit), and 3) instruction for primary language development and content instruction delivered in the primary language (in the subjects and grade levels authorized by the prerequisite credential or permit). The BCLAD authorization can be listed on a Single or Multiple Subject Teaching Credential as an emphasis if a college program was completed or, if the applicant met BCLAD requirements separate from the teacher preparation program, a BCLAD Certificate may be obtained.

Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD) - A state authorization to provide specialized instruction to individuals for whom English is a second language. Specifically, it authorizes instruction for 1) English Language Development (ELD) in preschool, K-12 and adults (restrictions apply to holders of Children Center Permits, Child Development Permits, and Designated Subjects Teaching Credentials) and 2) Specially Designed Academic Instruction Delivered in English (SDAIE) (in the subjects and grade levels authorized by the prerequisite credential or permit). The CLAD authorization can be listed on a Single or Multiple Subject Teaching Credential as an emphasis if a college program was completed or, if the applicant met CLAD requirements separate from the teacher preparation program, a CLAD Certificate may be obtained.

SB 1969 (Hughes) -- Created during the 1994 state legislative session, it established an alternative route for teachers to be assigned to teach English learners. Teachers who complete the staff development and pass an assessment are issued Certificates of Completion by school districts and County Offices of Education authorizing them to provide instruction in English-language development (ELD) and/or SDAIE to ELLs.

A Level Authorization – A district authorization to provide specialized instruction to individuals for whom English is a second language. Specifically, it is considered to be an intermediate and temporary step to obtaining the Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD). A Level Authorization signifies that the teacher has passed a district language proficiency test and is considered bilingual.

APPENDIX F
TEACHER YEARS OF SERVICE

TEACHER YEARS OF SERVICE

Years in District	Frequency	Percent
1	3	1.7
2	19	10.7
3	25	14.1
4	20	11.3
5	18	10.2
6	8	4.5
7	5	2.8
8	6	3.4
9	5	2.8
10	5	2.8
11	3	1.7
12	6	3.4
13	4	2.3
14	6	3.4
15	3	1.7
16	3	1.7
17	2	1.1
18	3	1.7
19	1	.6
21	1	.6
22	2	1.1
23	4	2.3
24	10	5.6
26	1	.6
27	2	1.1
28	1	.6
31	2	1.1
33	2	1.1
34	1	.6
35	1	.6
36	2	1.1
37	1	.6
39	1	.6
43	1	.6
Total	177	100.0

Years at school	Frequency	Percent
1	10	5.6
2	21	11.9
3	28	15.8
4	22	12.4
5	18	10.2
6	8	4.5
7	3	1.7
8	12	6.8
9	8	4.5
10	6	3.4
11	6	3.4
12	10	5.6
13	5	2.8
14	4	2.3
15	2	1.1
16	3	1.7
17	3	1.7
20	8	4.5
Total	177	100.0

APPENDIX G
ACTUAL NCE GAINS

Appendix G

Actual NCE Gains

Table 1

Matched Student Gains: Model Comparison

		Reading			Language		
		1999	2000	Gain	1999	2000	Gain
Grade 2	ELs (Model A)	38.5 (n=190)	39.4 (n=190)	0.9	35.8 (n=201)	40.1 (n=201)	4.3
	ELs (Model B)	33.1 (n=455)	33.9 (n=455)	0.9	33.0 (n=483)	33.8 (n=483)	0.8
Grade 3	ELs (Model A)	30.7 (n=159)	33.1 (n=159)	2.4	30.7 (n=162)	38.5 (n=162)	7.8
	ELs (Model B)	28.2 (n=382)	31.1 (n=382)	2.9	28.6 (n=410)	35.5 (n=410)	6.9

Table 2

Matched Student Gains: Model in Practice Comparison

		Reading			Language		
		1999	2000	Gain	1999	2000	Gain
Grade 2	Model A Classrooms	41.3 (n=155)	42.1 (n=155)	0.8	38.5 (n=160)	42.9 (n=160)	4.4
	Model B Classrooms	33.1 (n=442)	34.3 (n=442)	1.2	32.8 (n=475)	34.6 (n=475)	1.8
Grade 3	Model A Classrooms	30.8 (n=130)	32.6 (n=130)	1.8	28.9 (n=135)	38.8 (n=135)	9.9
	Model B Classrooms	28.3 (n=368)	31.6 (n=368)	3.3	28.7 (n=394)	35.5 (n=394)	6.8

Table 4

Matched Student Gains by Teacher Credential

		Reading			Language		
Grade 2		**1999**	**2000**	**Gain**	**1999**	**2000**	**Gain**
Model A	**Emergency Credential**	34.8 (n=35)	34.0 (n=35)	-0.8	32.0 (n=38)	32.7 (n=38)	0.7
	Credential	39.4 (n=133)	41.1 (n=133)	3.7	36.7 (n=138)	43.0 (n=138)	6.3
Model B	**Emergency Credential**	33.2 (n=98)	33.1 (n=98)	0.1	31.6 (n=103)	32.0 (n=103)	0.4
	Credential	33.9 (n=321)	35.0 (n=321)	1.1	32.2 (n=344)	34.9 (n=344)	2.7
Grade 3							
Model A	**Emergency Credential**	24.0 (n=10)	27.7 (n=10)	3.7	22.5 (n=11)	30.6 (n=11)	8.1
	Credential	30.4 (n=138)	32.2 (n=138)	1.8	30.2 (n=140)	38.2 (n=140)	8.0
Model B	**Emergency Credential**	23.7 (n=47)	26.7 (n=47)	3.0	20.2 (n=53)	31.6 (n=53)	11.4
	Credential	28.7 (n=306)	32.0 (n=306)	3.3	29.2 (n=328)	36.1 (n=328)	6.9

Table 3

Matched Student Gains Controlling for ELD Level

		Reading			Language		
Grade 2		**1999**	**2000**	**Gain**	**1999**	**2000**	**Gain**
Model A	ELD 1-3	36.6 (n=166)	37.8 (n=166)	1.2	34.9 (n=177)	38.6 (n=177)	3.7
	ELD 4-5	51.2 (n=24)	49.8 (n=24)	-1.4	42.5 (n=24)	51.9 (n=148)	9.4
Model B	ELD 1-3	32.7 (n=421)	33.5 (n=421)	0.8	32.5 (n=446)	33.1 (n=446)	0.6
	ELD 4-5	38.2 (n=34)	38.4 (n=34)	0.2	40.0 (n=37)	42.3 (n=37)	2.3
Grade 3							
Model A	ELD 1-3	28.0 (n=113)	30.7 (n=113)	2.7	27.2 (n=116)	35.7 (n=116)	8.5
	ELD 4-5	37.4 (n=46)	38.9 (n=46)	1.5	39.3 (n=46)	45.4 (n=46)	6.1
Model B	ELD 1-3	26.5 (n=284)	28.8 (n=284)	2.3	26.2 (n=307)	33.2 (n=307)	7.0
	ELD 4-5	33.1 (n=97)	37.9 (n=97)	4.8	35.8 (n=102)	42.5 (n=102)	6.7

Table 5

Matched Student Gains by Teacher Authorization - Grade 2

		Reading			Language		
Model A		**1998-99**	**1999-00**	**Gain**	**1998-99**	**1999-00**	**Gain**
Grade 2	BCLAD	38.9 (n=21)	39.8 (n=21)	0.9	36.9 (n=21)	39.6 (n=21)	2.7
	CLAD/LDS	40.5 (n=64)	40.7 (n=64)	0.2	39.3 (n=64)	44.4 (n=64)	5.1
	SB1969	38.4 (n=21)	44.3 (n=21)	5.9	35.6 (n=22)	46.8 (n=22)	11.2
	A Level	38.3 (n=31)	37.8 (n=31)	-0.5	34.8 (n=33)	35.7 (n=33)	0.9
	No Authorization	34.0 (n=31)	36.0 (n=31)	2.0	29.2 (n=36)	36.0 (n=36)	6.8
Model B							
Grade 2	BCLAD	33.2 (n=142)	35.0 (n=142)	1.8	33.3 (n=148)	37.4 (n=148)	4.1
	CLAD/LDS	35.3 (n=32)	37.3 (n=32)	2.0	36.3 (n=34)	37.3 (n=34)	1.0
	SB1969	35.7 (n=16)	32.7 (n=16)	-3.0	34.2 (n=17)	25.0 (n=17)	-9.2
	A Level	33.8 (n=155)	35.6 (n=155)	1.8	33.9 (n=155)	34.2 (n=155)	0.3
	No Authorization	33.3 (n=74)	30.9 (n=74)	-2.4	31.5 (n=93)	32.0 (n=93)	0.5

Table 6

Matched Student Gains by Teacher Authorization (Grade 3)

		Reading			Language		
Model A		**1998-99**	**1999-00**	**Gain**	**1998-99**	**1999-00**	**Gain**
Grade 3	BCLAD	25.0 (n=18)	32.2 (n=18)	7.2	26.7 (n=18)	41.8 (n=18)	15.1
	CLAD/LDS	31.9 (n=74)	33.4 (n=74)	1.5	30.7 (n=76)	40.3 (n=76)	9.7
	AB1969	–	–	–	–	–	–
	A Level	–	–	–	–	–	–
	No Authorization	28.8 (n=50)	30.9 (n=50)	2.1	28.1 (n=51)	34.4 (n=51)	6.3
Model B							
Grade 3	BCLAD	28.7 (n=197)	32.2 (n=197)	3.5	28.9 (n=212)	36.5 (n=212)	7.6
	CLAD/LDS	32.6 (n=48)	32.7 (n=48)	0.1	33.6 (n=51)	39.8 (n=51)	3.2
	AB1969	–	–	–	–	–	–
	A Level	24.5 (n=63)	29.7 (n=63)	5.2	23.8 (n=68)	32.0 (n=68)	8.2
	No Authorization	25.7 (n=44)	28.2 (n=44)	2.5	24.1 (n=49)	32.1 (n=49)	8.0